DISCUSSION

ON

MAKARENKO

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

35¢

Issued By
Jefferson Bookshop
575 Avenue of the Americas
New York City, New York

FOR DISTRIBUTION TO STUDENTS

THE MAKARENKO HERITAGE AND THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF SOVIET EDUCATION TODAY - AN EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION IN THE SOVIET PRESS, 1950 - 1951

PRECIOUS HERITAGE (By F. Vigdorova. Literaturnaya gazeta, Dec.19, pp.2-3; Dec. 21, p.2. Complete text:)

A. S. Makarenko's "A Pedagogical Poem" ("Road To Life") is one of the books of great import which will not become obsolete. From the very first lines, the reader's heart is caught and never again released. One reads with emotion, with warm sympathy, of the failures, of the stubborn search, of the inner questionings, of the endless thoughts during waking nights and, with an overwhelming joy, of the children of the Gorky Colony, formerly thieves and waifs, as they become honest people.

In spite of the numerous editions of the "Poem" during these past years, its copies have never remained on bookstore shelves. "Flags on the Towers," "A Book for Parents" and "Lectures on Raising Children" were instantly sold out. These books were sequels to the "Poem", and developed its ideas, its reflections, its enthusiasm; every one of their words was marked by the same ardor, conviction and faith in the force of education.

Makarenko wrote the last lines 11 years ago, but when one reads his books one is seized by the impression; how vivid and how applicable today! How important for today's schools!

But here is something beyond comprehension; Makarenko's books, which have stirred millions of hearts, have left deaf and indifferent those who, above all others, ought to have pondered them - the theoreticians of education.

Just glance at the textbooks on education; they always mention Makarenko with respect, they call him an innovator, author of classics of Soviet education, a remarkable theoretician and practitioner. Once this due is paid, the textbooks turn to other subjects.

The textbook on education by Prof. I.T. Ogorodnikov and P. N. Shimbirev contains the following passage: "Of course Makarenko's experiment is in many respects very special and cannot be applied in its original form in our schools which deal with normal children."

We agree that there is a difference in the methods of work in the colony and those applied in schools. But the most interesting thing in the above quotation is the term "normal children." Every reader of Makarenko's book knows that he brought up his pupils to be precisely normal people. When Zadorov, Karabanov and Vershnev registered at the Workers' University (Rabfak), they were no longer delinquents but true Soviet young men, members of the Young Communist League. It would be ridiculous to maintain that the pupils of the colony who helped Makarenko to transform Kuryazh were abnormal. It would be stupid and ludicrous to think that the intelligent and sensative group which succeeded in re-educating Igor Chernyavin and offered warmth to Vanya Galchenko was composed of defective children.

Moreover, Makarenko's books such as "A Book for Parents," "Lectures on Raising Children," or his articles, such as "Problems of Education in Soviet Schools" and "Will, Courage and Purposefulness," are devoted to the problems of

normal schools. We would not be risking error in asserting that the overwhelming majority of Makarenko's works are devoted to ordinary schools, to the upbringing of ordinary children, and not of those who have temporarily gone astray. And every time we read another book by Makarenko our conviction becomes strengthened on this point.

I. - Makarenko repeated tirelessly that the essence of his pedagogical experience could be boiled down to the formula: Demand the maximum from the human being and show him a maximum of respect. Why should this splendid thought of the outstanding educator of our time, based on the words of the great engineer of the human soul, Gorky, be exclusively for those who work with delinquents?

At that rate, one could say that Michurin's theory applies only to certain sorts of apples and that Michurinist thought can develop only in Tambov Province. It is senseless and harmful to stress the "special circumstances" of Makarenko's experiment and thus limit the general import of his thoughts, because every one of them has the most vital, the most actual, the most direct connection with normal children, normal schools and today's life.

Makarenko's archives contain character references of his pupils, which he wrote as they left the colony. He wrote about every one of these former thieves: "Perfectly honest," "Honest and noble personality." In every reference he wrote the word "a collectivist" as one of the most important traits of character, because Makarenko educated people for whom the pronoun I could not and was not allowed to become more important than we, for whom concern for themselves always yielded to concern for their comrades, for the group and for the country. A pupil, whatever might become of him in the future, must not strive in his life for individual perfection or merely to become a good and honest person. He must always speak and act as a member of the group and of society, responsible not only for himself but also for his comrades.

It was his pupils as a group, an active, hardworking, justly demanding and invariably sensitive group, that Makarenko considered his greatest achievement. He used to say that his main efforts during his 16 years of educational work under Soviet rule were spent on the creation of the group. And Makarenko does not merely declare that a group must be created, but immediately proceeds to show how this should be done.

"Nothing strengthens a group like a tradition," he would say. "The establishment of a tradition and its preservation is an extremely important task in educational work."

How many magnificent traditions, filled with content and deep significance, were there in Makarenko's colony! Let us remember how the pupils marked Gorky's birthday and celebrated the day of the first sheaf. Makarenko realized fully the miracle-working force of the common cause and knew how to create traditions which strengthen the ties of the group.

This living and precious experience is certainly needed in our schools today. The best schools are always those which possess their own tradition. In all of them, the meetings of alumni have become traditional. You would be told, in Moscow's schools Nos. 610, 110 or 273, in Vinnitsa's School No. 4 and in many others all over the country, of the importance of these meetings between the pupils of today and yesterday. And to look forward to these meetings and prepare for them collectively is very different from doing it individually.

Or let us take another tradition - the awarding of the gold and silver

medals. Usually, in the schools, it is a day of hearty and intelligent celebration for the best comrades. Any little first-grader as well as a member of the graduating class will be anxious to tell you how many medal winners there were during the past year and how many this year, what kind of people these medal winners are and why the school is proud of them. And to be collectively happy and proud is very different from being happy or proud individually!

However, life is not all celebrations. That is why intelligent and interesting traditions filled the life of Makarenko's colony every day and every hour. And we find, in this, many things which ought to be emulated and transplanted into the schools.

"Every joy of the group, even a small one.....makes it stronger and more cheerful," Makarenko used to say. "A man cannot live if he has nothing to look forward to and strive for. To educate a man is to determine the perspectives of his tomorrow's happiness." "In the first place, happiness itself must be organized, it must be introduced into life and presented as a real thing. In the second place, the simplest forms of happiness must be transformed into more complex forms which are more relevant from the human point of view.....One can start with a good dinner or a visit to the circus....but one must always indicate and gradually widen the perspectives of the whole group and reach the perspectives of the entire Soviet Union."

Large, comfortable Moscow School No. 122 is situated near a large, dirty, empty lot. If Makarenko had been the principal of that school, the empty lot would have been transformed into a garden or a summer playground and winter ice-skating rink. If Pioneers and Young Communists were given the idea of building a playground, they would do so with great enthusiasm, because they would be guided by a very simple idea: the idea of having a good time. But in the course of the work new and interesting problems would arise: what would be the best way to place the sports equipment and arrange the field, what would be the best way of fixing the poles and putting the crossbars, and, at that point, the simple prospect of having a good time would be replaced by something more valuable: the striving for achievement in work. Some of the pupils would display organizing abilities; the ability to take command, to organize the work, to economize effort, not only their own, but that of their comrades as well; and here we are in the presence of a new, higher prospect of close happiness. A group working in a coordinated, unanimous fashion and daily seeing more and more important prospects opening up necessarily becomes a united family and the collective efforts of all the members become the source of great joy to everyone.

But it is neither a garden nor a playground near School No. 122; only a gray and dreary empty lot. Apparently, those in charge think that the idea of prospective joy is too "special" and do not think it fit to be applied in their school that deals with normal children. It sounds as though our normal children do not need this joy of tomorrow, as though it cannot have any favorable effect on their upbringing!

II. - "Every act of an individual pupil," Makarenko used to say, "every one of his successes and failures must be considered against the background of the general task, as a success (or failure) of the general undertaking. This educational criterion must be applied to every school day, to every movement of the group."

Has this become a law and rule in all the schools? No. Of course everyone understands the importance of creating public opinion in a class or school. But this is what always happens in actuality: a boy is at fault, the class

teacher reprimands him, explains to him why he is wrong, and forgets completely to enlist the attention of the Pioneer detachment and the Young Communist group. Thus the quarrelsome or lazy student fears the teacher, but he would never think of fearing the judgment of his comrades. But if the Pioneer or Young Communist organizations did their real job, if they were a mainstay of the teaching staff, discipline would cease to be exclusively the teacher's concern and become a tradition which would always be remembered, and every minute of the class, every grain of knowledge would be considered precious.

Divorce between upbringing and study is impossible in Soviet schools. Our people face tasks unprecedented in history. The demands upon the participants in this unprecedented work daily grow higher and higher. Advanced technology and the transformation of nature demand that a Soviet citizen have a rounded and thorough education. Makarenko, who was, by the way, unjustly accused of neglecting education, said very effectively and very much to the point that "Education in our country is a part of life, it has ceased to be the erudition of the consumer of life and has become the tool of the producer of life." And it is in the schools that the foundations of knowledge are laid. This is why every class is so important, for every one of its 45 minutes.

In the effort to acquire solid, deep knowledge and discipline, a well-organized school group with proper personality and traditions is of prime importance. In the hall of Moscow's School No. 324 is a poster with the slogan: "Love your school, guard its honor, respect its traditions." The Young Communist committee proposed to form a group to study the history of their school. "Children, those who will graduate from our school must know who of their comrades were the defenders of the motherland during the great patriotic war (1941-1945), who became scientists, what achievements were attained by which of their schoolmates....They must also know about the teachers who have devoted many years of their lives to public education." The Young Communists said this and carried it out.

The personality, the honor and the renown of the school are represented by its people, the school children and teachers. This does not separate the schools from one another, it brings them closer and helps them to bring up and teach all Soviet children. The school in Gorki is proud of its name, "V. I. Lenin's Memory." The pupils of School No. 100, who know of the noble life of the honored teacher, I. I. Zelentsov, love their school even more. The history of each school has its own glorious pages and its own remarkable people, and all the pupils should know about them.

Moscow's Secondary School No. 201 bears the glorious name of Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya. This is not a mere formality, a simple signpost. All the pupils, of all ages, know about Zoya's life and her act of heroism. Zoya's life is an example for them and a subject for meditation. This name unites them, makes them feel members of the same family and sets high demands upon them.

Of course extracurricular work should be organized in accordance with the children's ages. Nevertheless, the older and the younger children must become personally acquainted, there must be contact between them, and everybody should meet at school events.

Children between ten and eighteen lived in Makarenko's colony. But all of them, of all ages, lived by the common interests of the colony, by its joys and its perspectives. The older children always took charge of the little ones, and this also contributed to welding the colony into a united group.

During the past school year the teaching staff of Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya

School (No. 201) attended a series of lectures on application of Makarenko's ideas in the schools. The lecturers did not speak of the special circumstances of Makarenko's experience. They looked for a way for their school to take advantage of this wonderful and rich experience. They saw that many things thought and said by the remarkable pioneer in education had direct bearing on their work and that was why they made "Makarenko's Pedagogical Heritage" the theme of the year. Each lecture led to practical conclusions, and they strove to translate each idea into action.

Thus one new tradition has appeared. The first-graders finish their alphabet during the second trimester. It is a great event when a page which had so far been dumb begins to talk. The children have learned to read. They begin to prepare for the celebration which the school organizes to mark that occasion. They learn poems by heart and don their best uniforms. Then the principal, the director of studies and the senior pupils enter the class and the little ones, one after the other, display their ability to read, write and count. They are praised for their progress and told: "You have learned how to read. Here is a reader for you: 'Our Native Tongue.'" This simple and good tradition is imbued with deep significance, it unites the little ones with the older ones. The children will long remember this celebration of their new ability to read, of the first friendship with a book received from their seniors.

In this school, the senior Young Communists are in charge of the pupils of the lower grades. They are not the youngsters' tutors, they are not there to give them "tutoring" assistance, but simple to exercise upon them a comradely influence and the responsibility of the older for the younger. A firm, fraternal friendship unites the seniors and the smallest, and this unites the entire school group even more strongly.

Makarenko constantly repeated that a group should be preserved intact, that transfer of children from one group to another is bad for them. This is why in School No. 201 classes are never split even in extracurricular work. Every class receives its yearly assignment of work on the school garden. The garden is a large one, two hectacres, and all the work is done by the school children themselves. The children are proud of the results of their work and of the fact that the residents of the district speak highly of the garden. A garden grown by one's own efforts contributes in turn to the growth of a person's love of comradely work for the common good, love for true beauty and the ability to master nature and to transform the land.

III. - In some of our schools the notion of discipline is reduced to the idea of regulation and order. Makarenko's notion of discipline is infinitely deeper: "What is discipline? In the practice of some of our teachers and theoreticians of education discipline is sometimes presented as a means of education. I hold that discipline is not a means of education but a result of education, and as such must be distinguished from regulations. Regulations are a complete set of means and methods which are of assistance in the educational task. But discipline is precisely the result of education." Later, elaborating his thought, Makarenko said discipline is, above all, not a means of education, but its result, and that only at a later stage does it become a means.

Makarenko saw discipline as an ethical and political phenomenon. Discipline as a result of upbringing consists not simply in the ability to behave in public and not to draw comment. But this result of education appears when a man, left to himself, knows how to act and is organically incapable of acting improperly. Makarenko thought that inhibitive discipline, which is manifested in innumerable taboos, misses its purpose: Don't do this, don't do that, don't throw the inkpot

at the wall. Such rules create nothing but obedience and superficial order. Of course, it is absolutely indispensible to learn to obey, keep order, and know how to restrain oneself, but it is impossible to limit oneself to the inculcation of these qualities.

"Soviet discipline," Makarenko used to say, "is the discipline of overcoming, the discipline of struggle and of progress, the discipline of striving for a goal." The truth of these words is evident.

Formerly the teachers alone were concerned with preserving order in Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya School. "This was far from successful," reported N. V. Vasilyev, director of studies. "The role of the study period teacher was not very attractive and even lowered his authority in the eyes of the children. The teacher on duty had to shout continuously: 'It's forbidden! Don't do that! Stop this!' until the children became accustomed to it and paid no attention to these prohibitions. Rules were constantly violated and the 'general punishments' had to be applied more and more often. At that point we made the students themselves take their turns of duty. The results were beyond our own expectations. And now the pupils are actually jointly responsible with the teachers for respect of the regulations and for recreation; they themselves maintain order in the refectory, in the cloakroom and in the reading room, they themselves organize their duties in the school ground, their lectures and concerts. All this has become the personal concern of every one of them. The common responsibility has united them and no one would any longer answer a remark of the study period teacher with: 'It's none of your business! Who on earth are you?' With all this, the teacher's authority not only did not decline but, on the contrary, rose, because, to be capable of guiding a children's group which is permeated with the feeling of responsibility and which is constantly progressing, the teacher himself is obliged to grow constantly in stature."

Probably there are no books in the world which could describe with greater paasion than Makarenko's the great importance of the teacher and of his responsibility not only for teaching but also for bringing up the children. He often repeated: "No other work demands as much flexibility as the work of a teacher. No sort of standardized approach can ever be applied to any pupil." Makarenko declared that a student group is impossible without a coordinated, friendly and permanent group of teachers. And, as was his custom, he worked on that question thoroughly, dwelling on every detail and repeating that every aspect of it is important and significant: the experience of each teacher, his character and his relationahip, not only with the children, but also with the other teachers, his working comrades!

In the school at Gulevetsk, Kalinin District, Vinnitsa Province, five principals succeeded one another within a five-year period and the teaching staff kept changing all the time. Can such a school function successfully? Of course not. It is difficult to teach and educate children if the teacher or the principal does not even know his pupils by sight. In the Gorky Colony and Dzerzhinsky Commune the educational work was successful precisely because it was entrusted to selected, well-coordinated teaching staffs. Children entered these establishments unable or hardly able to read and write, and left with a sufficient knowledge to pass, all of them, the entrance examinations for the Workers' University (Rabfak).

Makarenko used to say that Soviet teachers should be highly cultured, possess a rounded education and be good citizens. To bring up true builders of the classless society the educator must himself possess the high qualities of a citizen and patriot and must constantly keep in mind that, as Makarenko put it: "All work done in class is educational work."

Makarenko long ago formulated a question which was until recently neglected by our pedagogy: the question of the Young Communist organization in the school group. Makarenko always considered the Young Communists his most reliable assistants. They were always the conscience of the group, they were respected and their advice was heeded. They formed the real nucleus of the colony. It was with the assistance of the Young Communists that Makarenko trained the group to approach every occurance in the colony in a Bolshevist fashion, and to be always demanding and faithful to their principles.

IV. - Reading Makarenko, one is once more convinced of the difficulty of education. But how rich and interesting it is! This man, who has been accused by hypocrites and pharisees of lack of respect for pedagogical theory, proved, as no one before him, that education is "the most dialectical, mobile, complex and many-sided science."

Let us take the question of punishment. There has always been such confusion on this point! There were people who reproached Makarenko for the abuse of punishment, who remembered the case of Zadorov and maintained that Makarenko was an advocate of corporal punishment! In making such a preposterous assertion they could not possibly have known Makarenko. "Can a blow ever be a method? No, it is only a symptom of despair," Makarenko used to say. He went even further and declared that punishment must exclude not only physical but also all moral suffering. What, then, is the essence of punishment? It is "the feeling of being disapproved of by the group, the awareness of having done wrong; in other words, there is no oppression in punishment but awareness of the mistake, consciousness of even the slightest estrangement from the group." Makarenko proved that in a successful group punishment must not be meted out according to set standards but vary according to the individual. Thus, for instance, a young man has misbehaved and the general meeting of the community decides that on such a day and at such an hour he must think about his misdeed. The thought that he will have to report to the general meeting when he has pondered upon his mistake will make him feel bad.

Or let us take another instance. Where one of the senior members of the commune was found at fault, the commune adopted the following resolution: "Let Pioneer K., the youngest member of the commune, explain to Young Communist So-and-So what his behaviour ought to have been under the given circumstances." And then, surely, the Young Communist, already a grown young man, would no longer make mistakes in matters plain enough to be understood by a little child.

Makarenko went further. He was convinced that those capable of understanding should be more severely treated and that those who understood less should be last to be punished or even deprived (yes, precisely, "deprived") of punishment.

Often the school waits until a child does something scandalous and only then proceeds feverishly with his "education." It was precisely this "emergency" education that Makarenko had in mind when he wrote: "The student who is never at fault does not interest us; we do not know where he is headed and what character is developing in him under the outer orderliness, nor do we know how to find out about it." The task, worthy of the theory and practice of our education, is to discover every pupil's character, to find in it the seed of something better, to force this seed to sprout, to take care of and look after the young plant, to know how to plan the future personality and not to leave things to chance, to their own way. There is much to learn on this score from Makarenko's books.

Our schools do not remain stagnant but constantly progress and improve.

Why, then, do Makarenko's books, written more than ten years ago, seem still so full of life and so timely? Makarenko used to repeat often that the pedagogy of tomorrow needed to be created. He was capable of seeing far ahead, of seeing in the present the seeds of the future. This is why, when our teachers take a step forward, they look again to Makarenko for counsel and confirmation of their ideas. A Bolshevik and a pioneer in education, he brilliantly carried out in practice the tasks of communist education and enriched the Soviet science of education. He succeeded because, in his theory as well as his practice, he always based himself upon what is most important.

"....The general ideas of Marxism on education, the pronouncements of Lenin and Stalin," he wrote, "give a perfectly clear setting to the field of education and leave great freedom for creative educational work."

Yes, our schools have made considerable progress. Probably, by today's standards, certain things in the heritage left by Makarenko have become obsolete and many propositions have been worked out more profoundly and with greater precision. But it is senseless to bar his ideas from the schools and to limit them. No, Makarenko's educational method is not at all limited to "young delinquents." Makarenko used to say on that very subject: "Even if you had entrusted me with genuine angels with little wings, real cherubs and seraphs, I still would have brought them up exactly the same way, because this way holds the essence of our socialist attitude to man."

Of course, it is impossible to mention all Makarenko's pedagogical principles in a newspaper article. It is also impossible to mention everything because, while reading Makarenko's books, one realizes that he did not stand still, that his ideas went on developing and that they became more and more mature and profound every year.

One may take any problem - be it physical education, be it the formation of a body of teachers, be it the relationship between school and parents, be it parental authority, be it inculcation of the feeling of duty and honor, of will and personality - one always finds that Makarenko had raised the same question or thoroughly worked it out, and that he always grasped the essential elements: the perspective possibilities, the path of development and the fundamental link. And every one of his lines breathes faith in the capacity of communist education and its unlimited potentialities. "I categorically demand and have repeated all my life: Not 1% of substandard production, not a single living failure!" Makarenko declared in his speech to Moscow teachers 18 months before his death.

In many schools all over the country people are beginning to study, ever more carefully, the rich, bright heritage which teaches every teacher how to become a searcher and a creator in his profession. Yet now the principal of Moscow's School No. 610, L. A. Pomerantseva, declares, and most other school principals could confirm it, that the young teachers arriving at her school from the teachers' colleges are, as a rule, familiar with Makarenko's works only by hearsay. In the teachers' colleges they are given only the most superficial data on Makarenko. The authors of textbooks on education mention fleetingly and condescendingly "Makarenko's system," as though they were unaware that Makarenko's system embodies the best traits of our vital and creative Soviet educational system. Basing himself on Marxism-Leninism, Makarenko boldly opened new paths in educational theory and practice. Relying on his practical experience, brilliantly generalizing the experience of our best schools, giving a profound analysis of the experience of the education of the many-millioned masses of the Soviet people, education which began from the first day of the revolution, from the first word pronounced by Lenin, from the first engagements of the Civil War, Makarenko was

able to formulate the most important principles of communist education of children, and he worked out its methodology. And the Soviet schools, Soviet teachers and our children need Makarenko, with all the riches of his ardent thought and with all his precious experience.

(Editor's Note: F. Vigdorova only touches upon some of the questions connected with the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. The editors invite readers - teachers, parents, artists, writers, workers in higher education, collective farm officials - to express their opinion on the pedagogical heritage left by A. S. Makarenko and its application in school practice.)

KEPT ON A LENTEN DIET OF ACADEMIC DISCOURSES - Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (By L. Pomerantseva, Honored Teacher of the Russian Republic and Principal of Moscow's School No. 610. Literaturnaya gazeta, March 10, p.2. Condensed text:)

I recently received a letter from a student at the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute. She wrote: "My course in teaching seems to me just one long recital of formulas. I can give very precise answers to questions such as what is character training, what is instruction, what is the role of the teacher and the principal in the character training process, and many others. But behind these formulas I do not sense vital life, our schools or our children. The lectures and textbooks on teaching contain almost no examples, only general, abstract discussion without concrete description of how one should act."

This is not the first time I have heard such reactions to the way pedagogy is taught in our higher educational institutions.

The Soviet teacher needs A. S. Makarenko's creative thought, his quests, his "finds:" they suggest new methods and directions for communist character training. Makarenko's works help the young teacher to understand the essence of communist teaching, they make him grow to love his profession and not only to love it, but to become a creator in it.

I have read more than one textbook on teaching, but from them I learned more about the ideas of Rousseau and Spencer than about Anton Semyonovich Makarenko. The important thing in the Makarenko heritage is not the various techniques he used, but the principles of education that underlay all his work. These are ideas and principles of education which it is important to understand and master. Makarenko's wealth of ideas constitutes a whole and should not be broken up into a number of techniques and examples mechanically applied to illustrate one or another situation in education. But this is just what we find in the textbook by I.Ogorodnikov and P. Shimbirev. In the chapter on "Training the Pupil for Work and Through Work" there is a subheading "Work in A. S. Makarenko's System." In the chapter "Young Communist League and Pioneer Organizations in the School and Their Role in Formation of the Student Group" there is a subheading "A.S. Makarenko's Experience in Formation of the Group."

This method impresses me as utterly wrong. The idea should not be to emphasize a few of Makarenko's thoughts, but to imbue the whole textbook with them, and, by setting forth these ideas, to provide the future teacher with an understanding of what is meant by Soviet teaching and communist character training. In those few instances in which the authors of the textbooks go beyond cursory reference to Makarenko's ideas and attempt to analyze them, nothing good, unfortunately, comes of it.

I shall try to prove my point. The children's group occupies a central

place in Makarenko's ideas. Proceeding from the doctrines of Lenin and Stalin, Makarenko sets as the aim of his educational work the formation of the group. The group, said Makarenko, is a complex of personalities striving toward a goal. The group is not only held together by friendship, but cemented by common responsibility and by common participation in work. Makarenko believed that without the perspective of a great and happy goal there is no way of organizing the group.

As was always his way, Makarenko not only set forth his thoughts in theory but backed them up with his magnificent experience. His books make crystal clear how to build the children's group; all the information is here: the forms, the style and the spirit of the group, the establishing of traditions, and much more.

Now let us see what the textbook says in the section, "A. S. Makarenko's Experience in Formation of the Group." "Taking into consideration his pupils' background, especially the youngsters' love of adventure," write Ogorodnikov and Shimbirev, "Makarenko, by agreement with the forestry service, undertook to protect the state forest from ravage and looting by local kulaks. The members of the children's colony went about their work enthusiastically and their past experience helped them. As a result, Makarenko could observe 'the first signs of a good group spirit.'"

Several pages later the authors conclude: "Makarenko's ability to absorb the youngsters in the interesting work of guarding the forest and 'catching' pilferers, which provided an outlet for their propensity for adventure, is worthy of attention. Of course, pedagogically speaking, such 'work' is unsuitable for normal school children (emphasis mine. -L.P.), but by applying the principle of taking the youngsters' interests into consideration, the school can devise activities which have more character training value and at the same time interest and attract teen-age students (for example, an extended field trip, a Young Pioneer camp, military games, sports, etc.)"

All this sounds more than strange. No one is going to object to field trips or games; they are of great importance in character training, they satisfy the inclination which children, all children, regardless of their "background", have for adventure. But in enlisting the colony members to guard the forest Makarenko was not only considering their "background" (by which the authors mean criminal background) and their "inclination to adventure;" he was appealing to the best in them, he absorbed them in a genuinely great and important state task - saving the forest from kulak thievery. And in the practical accomplishment of the task the group was born. Concern for the national wealth, for socialist property, is a most essential and necessary trait of the new morality. How can one be content to pay mere lip service to the importance of this trait, to the necessity of instilling it in the children, and at the same time declare the workable, feasible and practical participation of children in the protection of socialist property not permissible?

The manner and circumstances in which children participate in the national task of protecting socialist property may vary, of course, but such participation is possible and does not at all conflict with the job of character education, "pedagogically speaking."

The education textbook constantly reiterates: "The teacher should." Certainly, there is much the teacher should do. But why has the science of education given him so little help up to now? Why, reading Makarenko, do we all understand not only our duties, but how to carry them out: while, reading education textbooks, the student learns nothing about ways and means, does not find an answer to the

primary question: "how?" ....."Our millions of young teachers cannot be kept on a Lenten diet of academic discourses," wrote Makarenko. But the education textbooks today are just such collections of Lenten, academic discourses.....

THE MOST IMPORTANT THING. - Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (By S. Kalabalin. Literaturnaya gazeta. March 24, p. 2. Condensed text:)

I frequently hear the remark: "What! Does someone object to Makarenko's ideas? Why, so many articles about him have been published lately and so many dissertations are being written on his views on education!"

It is true that many articles and dissertations are written. But too many of these are abstract, of the kind that approach the question not in concrete but in "general" terms.

I agree, with those who say that Anton Semyonovich's (Makarenko's) experience cannot be transplanted into our schools in its pure form. But why don't they say just what part of this experience, in their authoritative opinion, can be utilized and what has become obsolete and cannot?

Many, for example, believe it suffices to introduce troops and captains in the school and Anton Semyonovich's ideas are carried into effect. But do these really matter? Actually, it is not at all desirable to carry over into the school the captains' council, the troops, the bestowal of the "colonist" badge and much else that played so great a role with us in the colony. Anton Semyonovich never prescribed any organizational recipe as a serum which, injected into a children's institution suffering from disorganization, would immediately correct matters. Mechanical application of Anton Semyonovich's methods is not beneficial and will result only in senseless and twisted imitation.

What to do, then? How can we utilize Anton Semyonovich's heritage in concrete and practical fashion in the schools? The working teacher turns to our science of education for an answer. And what response does he get? The theoreticians either shrug their shoulders and escape into allegories or they deafen the ordinary unsophisticated teacher with the words "specific nature" (of Makarenko's colony), "normal," "abnormal," and the matter is closed.

I do not know whether there are abnormal children. In 25 years of working with children I have never met any. But I have often encountered abnormal environment and abnormal upbringing. Right here, incidentally, let me express a decided protest against the label "abnormal" that is applied to the members of the Gorky Colony. I will remember all of my comrades and I say that among them there was not one psychopathic personality or mentally retarded child.....

Not very long ago, in January, 1951, I unexpectedly found myself in one of the Kiev schools. It was a magnificent building - plenty of light, excellent classrooms and offices - but disorder reigned supreme: shouting, running, pushing, fighting. The teachers, dodging to avoid being knocked off their feet, dashed with habitual haste from the classrooms to the teachers' room. On finishing the day, the children, practically tearing the door off its hinges, tumbled out of school with unruly shrieks and uproar. All of this seemed to me certainly quite abnormal.

What is wrong with this school? The trouble is that it has no students' group and no teachers' group. Everyone is separate, apart, and if a teacher assumes the duties of character training it is on an individual basis, teacher

and student face to face, in utter isolation from the group. The teacher explains, grows angry and becomes indignant, while the student more often than not listens in silence....

The most important thing in Anton Semyonovich is his teaching about the children's group. The Soviet man can be raised correctly and in the Soviet manner only in the group. In this respect no educator has the right to act individually, on his own: "There must be an educators' group, and where the educators are not joined in a group and the group does not have a single plan of work, a single spirit, a single definite approach to the child, there can be no character training." This means that the teachers should be united in a group, animated by a single thought, a single principle and a single style. Only under these conditions can the children's group be created with reasonable and joyful discipline, with a fine and happy goal, in reaching which the group grows and becomes stronger and wiser. Only in such a group will the child not regard discipline as something tedious, monotonous, and bothersome, imposed from without. Experience will convince him that discipline is the best means of attaining the common goal. In the group he will develop a sense of duty, he will learn to devote his personal efforts to the group cause; more exactly, the group cause will become his own.....

One of Anton Semyonovich's finest discoveries, "the logic of parallel educational action," increases beyond measure the teacher's power for character training: he is given the opportunity to influence the student not only directly, without intermediaries, but through the group as well. If any one of the children transgresses, not only the child himself, but the group of which he is a member must answer. Need one explain how this develops within the child a sense of responsibility to the group, to his comrades? Moreover, the others in the group do not remain passive, there is an educational effect upon the group itself, for it censures the action of its comrade, relives his deed, reflects on it and perceives its responsibility for the conduct of each of its members.....

I am firmly convinced it is impossible to teach teachers, it is impossible to train them, if you yourself are remote and isolated from the school. Anton Semyonovich never would have written his remarkable books on character training if he had not devoted his whole life to children.

And if many theoreticians of education to this day insist on the "specific" nature of Anton Semyonovich's experience, if such books as P. N. Gruzdev's "Problems of Character Training and Instruction" and N. K. Goncharov's "Principles of Education" merely mention Anton Semyonovich's name in passing, I maintain that these scholars are actually ignorant of the needs of the modern school and of the thoughts of our teachers.

ABOUT THE 'LENTEN DIET' AND THE PEDAGOGICAL HERITAGE OF A. S. MAKARENKO - Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (By Prof. P. Shimbirev. Literaturnaya gazeta, March 29, P.2. Condensed text)

The question of the training of young teachers was extensively discussed recently at an open Party meeting of the Moscow Province Pedagogical Institute.... There are still many shortcomings in the system of teacher training, of course, and it was to these that the attention of the Party meeting and of the entire Institute was directed. But these shortcomings provide no basis for such wholesale denunciations of our entire system of teacher training as Comrades Vigdorova and Pomerantseva have made.

Pomerantseva declares that the young teacher, fresh out of a pedagogical institute, entering the school and left face to face with the student group, ex-

periences a painful feeling of uncertainty and helplessness (Literaturnaya gazeta, March 10). Vigdorova professes the same opinion. In her well known book, "My Class" she tells of a teacher just graduated from the institute who, on meeting her class for the first time, supposedly did not know what to do and intuitively picked up V. Garshin's tale "The Wayfaring Frog" to read to the pupils.

One can imagine that young teachers who revealed ineptitude and unpreparedness in class work might have turned up at the school which Comrade Pomerantseva directs. But should one generalize from such cases and apply the generalization to all graduates of pedagogical institutions? After all, students in teachers' training colleges are not limited to "the Lenten diet" of educational textbooks. They study the methodology of their subject and they have a 12-week practice period in the schools, during which they observe the lessons and themselves teach and conduct educational work in the classes to which they are assigned....

Now about the "Lenten diet" of the education textbooks. The education textbook by Ogorodnikov and Shimbirev is now being discussed in the pedagogical institutes of Moscow. In the course of this discussion major shortcomings have been and will be brought to light. Many of these shortcomings were acknowledged long ago by the authors themselves. Other education textbooks have substantial imperfections as well. But is it proper for Comrade Pomerantseva to conclude from this that the education textbooks completely fail to equip future teachers for their work in the schools?

Comrade Pomerantseva declares that our textbook represents "academic discourse." This is obviously gross exaggeration. In working on the textbook I relied on my own teaching experience and on study of the experience of the contemporary Soviet school, with which I remain in constant contact. Of course, this does not preclude possible errors in the textbooks.

From the articles of Comrades Pomerantseva and Vigdorova one might conclude, however, that the teaching courses as now offered in the pedagogical institutes should be abandoned and replaced by the teaching of pedagogy as found in the works of A. S. Makarenko. Undoubtedly Makarenko's works do represent an extremely valuable contribution to the science of education. His works provide a generally correct and scientific solution to many problems in the theory and practice of communist character training: such problems as the character training of the group, conscious discipline, labor training, and a number of problems of family upbringing. For this reason Literaturnaya gazeta very appropriately initiated a discussion of the question of applying Makarenko's pedagogical heritage in the work of the schools and other educational institutions. However, with all respect to the memory of A. S. Makarenko, one cannot regard him as singly representing the whole of Soviet pedagogy.

If we give credence to Comrade Pomerantseva, it appears that "Makarenko was able to formulate the most important principles of the communist education of children and worked out its methodology" (Literaturnaya gazeta, Dec. 21, 1950). But up to now we were all convinced that the founders of Marxism-Leninism established and formulated the most important principles of communist upbringing. Makarenko was very modest and certainly never made such a claim for himself.....

The authors of education textbooks therefore cannot confine themselves to "imbuing" the textbook with the ideas of A. S. Makarenko alone, but must reflect in all their fullness the teachings of the Marxist-Leninist classics regarding communist character training and the directives of the Party and Government concerning the schools, and must devote space to the valuable ideas of N.K. Krupskaya and M.I. Kalinin.

Can a complete textbook be written by setting forth only the ideas of A. S. Makarenko? It is common knowledge that Makarenko centered all his attention on problems of methods in character training and did not concern himself with questions of teaching or methods of instruction. It would be difficult, therefore, to "imbue" that very important part of education - teaching - with Makarenko's ideas. All the more since in his observations on instruction Makarenko committed some grave errors. For example, he denied the need to connect instruction in the class with production.....In fact, as Makarenko himself acknowledges, his school "had no connection whatsoever with production." This is all the more regrettable, for having a shop with the best equipment, Makarenko could have attained great success in applying the principle of polytechnical training.

Even in the sphere of character training not all of Makarenko's observations are indisputable. Not long ago a dissertation was defended which strongly recommended the "explosion method" to the schools. Essentially, this method consists of letting a conflict build up to "the final extremity," "when the question is put point blank: shall you remain a member of society or withdraw from it?" Makarenko's "explosion method" found expression in ostracism and other "forms of collective indignation" against the offending pupil. In the light of Comrade Stalin's admonition to "comrades fascinated by explosions," we should decisively condemn any attempt to implant the "explosion method" in our schools and recognize that the method is antipedagogical.

Even in the matter of the character training of the group Makarenko committed a serious error. He recommended establishment of a children's group containing both small children and older youths of 17 or 18. Organization of the group on the basis of age Makarenko considered erroneous, the result of the influence of "pedagogical literature which regards age as one of the decisive factors in character training." The fallaciousness of this statement of Makarenko's is obvious. When different age groups are intermingled in the "group" there can be no thought of independent activity by the younger children. It thus becomes understandable why things did not go smoothly with Makarenko's Young Pioneers, a fact he himself acknowledged. It also becomes clear why the younger children did not occupy their rightful place in his educational work. For this reason in matters concerning the Young Pioneer movement, teachers, regardless of their love for Makarenko, should refer not to him but to the valuable counsel of N.K. Krupskaya.

One cannot regard as correct F. Vigdorova's advice to follow Makarenko's instructions and "completely deprive (yes, deprive!) the less conscious students of punishment." Naturally, the less conscious students are usually the offenders, so such an "application" of Makarenko's ideas would lead to complete absence of punishment, which would hardly help to raise the level of discipline. Downright comical is another of Vigdorova's "suggestions," that, after the example of Makarenko, whenever a Young Communist League member commits an offense, the "smallest Pioneer," that is, a third-grade pupil, be sent to him to "explain" the nature of his guilt. Such a "suggestion" smacks of the long past stage of "leftist" methods of character training, when children "trained" their parents, challenging them to socialist competition....

From the foregoing examples it is apparent that the Makarenko pedagogical heritage even in the field of character training cannot be utilized in its entirety or as a system but only in individual parts....

Some overzealous admirers of Makarenko, who have driven the school in the direction of uncritical application of his heritage and are intolerant of even the slightest attempts to criticize various of Makarenko's theses, have done Soviet education a disservice. They evidently seriously suppose that Makarenko had creat-

ed a complete "pedagogy for tomorrow," anticipating everything dozens of years in advance.

We should not forget that today we are confronted by new problems in character training, education and instruction, problems which Makarenko never considered or could consider. For this reason, while we creatively study and develop the heritage of this remarkable Soviet teacher, we must direct our principal attention to studying and generalizing the best experience of the contemporary Soviet school, and, enriched by the new experience, search for new, more effective paths and methods for the communist upbringing of the younger generation.....

PROF. SHIMBIREV IS WRONG. - Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (By Mikh. Skatkin, Corresponding Member of the Russian Republic Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. Literaturnaya gazeta, April 19, p.2. Condensed text:)

....Instead of heeding the just voice of criticism, Prof. Shimbirev has only revealed more clearly his own failure to understand A. S. Makarenko's web of ideas in his article "About the 'Lenten Diet' and the Pedagogical Heritage of A.S. Makarenko" (Literaturnaya Gazeta, No. 38, March 29). He charges Makarenko with a grave error in rejecting the connection between instruction and production. Prof. Shimbirev writes that "having a shop with the best equipment, Makarenko could have attained great success in applying the principle of polytechnical training." But he neglects to mention the sort of connection between labor and instruction against which Makarenko fought. Makarenko said:

"You surely remember the superstition that the process of labor must be 'linked' with the program of instruction. How we racked our brains over this cursed problem. The children made a stool, and it had to be connected with geography and mathematics. I used to feel very bad when a commission would arrive and fail to find the stool related to study of the Russian language. Finally I threw up my hands and began to declare plainly that there should not be a connection." Makarenko was quite right in rejecting just this sort of a connection between instruction and work. The men of the Soviet science of education, together with the foremost teachers, are searching now for correct and sound ways to join instruction with productive labor.

Referring to an anonymous dissertation, Prof. Shimbirev proposes to condemn categorically "any attempt to implant the 'explosion method' in the schools." But Makarenko never proposed "the implanting in the schools" of the explosion method. As concerns Makarenko's use of the term "explosion method" itself, it is well known that by this figure of speech he meant "a steady stream of categorical demands" upon the child, "a direct frontal attack, without any evasion, without any artifice." The purpose of this method, which Anton Semyonovich used rarely, in the exceptional cases of children whom "there was no controlling," was, in his own words, to induce "a speedy inhibition." Such a pedagogical method, soundly based on Pavlov's materialist physiology, can be employed in the schools in exceptional cases.

Take, for example, the story told by A. Dyleva-Kazanskaya, an experienced elementary school teacher: "After working in villages for 16 years I was assigned the third grade in one of the Moscow schools. The principal warned me, 'It's a class assembled from other classes and a very difficult one; there are 16 repeaters, including 6 who are extremely undisciplined. A strict teacher who commands the class's respect is now conducting it temporarily.'.....I prepared my first lesson so that I started work literally without giving the pupils a chance to collect themselves. I called them up quickly, one after another, in alphabetical

order, making certain to commend those who deserved it even in the slightest. And what happened? The children at once somehow mended their ways. I didn't let them out of my sight for even a minute. By running things smoothly and calmly I had, so to speak, seized the fort. And now - it was mine. By the end of the year I had succeeded in achieving very good results in the class, and most important, a sincere and direct relationship had been established among myself, the children and their parents."

What is the point of this story? The teacher, in order to "seize the fort" launched a "direct frontal attack," directed "a steady stream of categorical demands" at the class. Without question all the characteristics of the technique that Makarenko figuratively called "the explosion" are present here. It is wrong to draw an analogy between this pedagogical method and the philosophical concept of "explosion," as Prof. Shimbirev tries to do, and on that basis to declare the method in question antipedagogical. But it should be noted that if a teacher began to use such a technique at every lesson in an orderly class and kept all the children under such constant pressure, "not giving them a chance even to look around," she could turn a good technique into intolerable antipedagogical drill....

Prof. Shimbirev regards the organization of groups combining children of different ages as a further serious error of A. S. Makarenko. But it is well known that Makarenko did not deny the necessity of uniting the school children in class groups. He simply pointed out the danger that such a group might become withdrawn within itself and become isolated from the school group as a whole. On the basis of his long experience Makarenko came to the conclusion that outside of the class, in the daily life of the colony it was logical to combine the children in groups not based on age levels....

The interesting experience of Moscow School No. 273 may be cited by way of example. There a "Young Craftsmen's Club," numbering 300 pupils from the third through the tenth grade, has functioned successfully for many years. Some of the school's graduates are also members of the club. The entire membership of the club is broken down into brigades - electricians, radio operators, draftsmen, bookbinders, etc. Each brigade contains students of all ages and is headed by a good organizer, the most experienced upperclassman of the group....

Makarenko's ideas turn out scanty and impoverished in the textbook by Professors Shimbirev and Ogorodnikov, but it reeks, on the other hand, of the spirit of Herbartarianism. This is manifested in the abstract approach to the teaching process and the child's school work, treated apart from the totality of influences which the circumstances of life have upon him, and even apart from the very life of the child as a developing individual, living and working in the group. It is manifested further in the exaggerated notion of the role of instruction in character training and in the overrating of the influence of the spoken word in character training. Underlying these conceptions are the ideas of the well known German teacher and metaphysician Herbart, who declared that "from thoughts flow sensations and from these, principles and behavior." Makarenko, we know, sharply criticized "the incessant idle chatter about various good things." "The most determined drilling into an individual of commendable thoughts and learning, is a hollow pursuit," he said, "for at best he will turn out a pharisee or a phonograph." Exercises in behavior are necessary to build consciousness on experience, and Makarenko regarded the group as the gymnasium for such "gymnastics."

It is not necessary to dwell on the method of argument used by Prof. Shimbirev. His education textbook was criticized lightly and he immediately charged Comrades Vigdorova and Pomerantseva with sweeping condemnation of our entire system of teacher training.

They took Prof. Shimbirev to task for poorly reflecting Makarenko's ideas and failing to bring them out in his textbook. And then he talks as if they demand that he imbue the textbook with A. S. Makarenko's ideas alone....

You can't argue that way!.... The Soviet science of education faces the still unresolved tremendously noble and vast task of creatively developing and applying in the schools the precious heritage of the outstanding Soviet teacher, A. S. Makarenko.

ABOUT PRESENT-DAY EDUCATION.- Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (By Tamara Leontyeva. Literaturnaya gazeta, May 12, p.2. Condensed text:)

....The theoretic conclusions of A. S. Makarenko, which were hammered out on the forge of his remarkable experience and have withstood the test of time, are securely deposited in the golden treasury of the Soviet science of education.

The principle of one-man executive responsibility for which Makarenko fought, the principle of stable guidance, the demand for a clear-cut system of organization and conscious discipline, for a close bond between the teachers' group and the students' group, for perspectives (to be held out to the student body) - - all of these we find in the modern school system.

In the light of all this, can it be said that the schools are not putting Makarenko's ideas into practice, as F. Vigdorova contends in her article "Precious Heritage?" Can one suppose that the practice in our schools is not based on the principle: "Demand the maximum from the individual and show him a maximum of respect," when this is one of the fundamental precepts of Soviet humanism?.....One cannot but agree with Prof. Shimbirev that some of Comrade Vigdorova's "suggestions" (deprivation of punishment, conversion of vacant lots) are doctrinaire.

It is these suggestions, on the content of which I shall not dwell (Prof. Shimbirev has already discussed them in his article), that convince me not that the Soviet school is cut off from the science of education, as Vigdorova holds, but that Vigdorova herself is cut off from the vital life of the school.....One has only to attend the district teachers' conferences, which have become a tradition in the life of every teacher, to be convinced that the questions raised in the reports and discussions at these sessions are an echo of the energetic work carried on throughout our country. Tremendous speeds, assembly line production, television, radio location, etc., all make demands on the knowledge, discipline, precision accuracy and know-how of the school graduate, on his organizing skill and political consciousness, such as the times of the heroes of the "Pedagogical Poem" never knew.....Makarenko's writings were new for his day. What is evolving out of the experience of our schools is new for our day.

Marxist-Leninist character training, the Young Pioneer and Young Communist League organizations in the schools, the community work which trains organizers, the bond between school and parents and the forms it takes, and, lastly, the method of linking labor training of the children with the conventional school lessons far from complete the list of problems solved by the practical workers of the schools at these conferences. In all of this you have your "finds," your proposals, your valuable experience, which do not depart from the ideas of Makarenko in the least.

Therefore when teacher Ryazanova in the city of Lysva takes her first-graders of an evening to watch the stars light up over the shops that have fulfilled the plan, and, with the help of this example, teaches them discipline in their school work, it is not necessary to ask her whether or not Makarenko recom-

mended that. When the teachers of Mytishchi Public School No. 2 in Moscow Province enroll their older girls as agitator's assistants during the election campaign and the girls help an elderly voter whitewash her room for election day, it hardly occurs to anyone to ask whether this is "according to Makarenko's method" or not. When Ye. V. Martynova, Principal of Moscow School No. 29 works on a study of the pupils' schedule and rallies the whole teachers' group around this problem, it is scarecely necessary to ask whether she is carrying out Makarenko's principles or not.....No, I do not feel that neglect of the precious Makarenko heritage is one of the most serious shortcomings of many of the practical workers and theoreticians of Soviet education; on the contrary.

Last summer I had occasion to visit the country cottage of one of the large Moscow children's homes....The Young Pioneer troops were competing at making up their beds neatly. When a troop earned a score of five (high score in Soviet school grades and games), its flag was moved ahead five spaces on a reforestation map of the country.....It has been announced that the first team to cross the finish line would receive tickets to the circus. The originators of this plan thought they were applying Makarenko's educational system: labor training (making up the beds), organization of the children's group (competition among the troops), future happiness (going to the circus), and connection with the life of the day (the map of the country's erosion-control forestation plan). It is hard to imagine what Makarenko would say if he knew his "spiritual heirs" were construing his educational methods so formalistically!

This is not an isolated instance. Ignorant icon worshippers have not ceased trying to channel the bright and flowing stream of Makarenko's keen mind and talent into preconceived pedagogical schemes and molds. Wrapping themselves in formal acceptance of Makarenko's ideas and, what is more, proclaiming themselves the true champions of his heritage, they are busy demanding that the alleged "methods" of A. S. Makarenko be implanted in the children's homes, the schools, the trade schools and the Suvorov (military) academies, while in fact Makarenko himself warned carefully against making a fetish of just these "isolated methods." Moreover, they pass right by everything new that knocks at the doors of the schools. Not troubling themselves to develop Makarenko's heritage creatively, they most frequently withdraw into a round of abstract arguments as to whether some particular method is "Makarenko's method" or not and why it is not used in the school when it was successfully employed in the labor colony. Of course, it is easy to follow cut-and-dried recipes.....

The study of Marxist-Leninist philosophy carried on by the entire Soviet teaching profession is bearing fruit. Our teachers are constantly gaining a better comprehension of what Makarenko was fighting for, and mastering the dialectical art of teaching; this is why the teachers can hardly regard the slogan "back to Makarenko," put forward by Vigdorova and supporters of her viewpoint, as correct. No, "forward with Makarenko," say the thousands of working teachers, who make their corrections in the judgments offered by the theoreticians.....

PRECIOUS HERITAGE - Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (Literaturnaya gazeta, May 19, p.2. Condensed text:)

The Main Thing Is Not Mentioned. Ivanovo - It has been correctly pointed out that A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage must be approached creatively. But nobody mentions what is meant by the phrase "approach it creatively."

The periodical "Educational Work in Children's Homes" is published by the Children's Homes Administration of the Russian Republic Ministry of Education and

by the Central Scientific Methodological Office of Children's Homes. No. 19 of this periodical contained an article by Candidate of Pedagogical sciences A. Ter-Gevondyan called "Mass Cultural Work in the Pedagogical Experience of A. S. Makarenko." In his article Ter-Gevondyan describes several forms of mass cultural work employed by Makarenko: participation of the children in demonstrations on holidays of the revolution, general meetings in the commune, military games, children's amateur technical work projects, etc. The author ends his article with the conclusion that "creative and active assimilation" of Makarenko's system of cultural enlightenment work "is one of the immediate tasks of school teachers and educators in children's homes." By directing teachers to apply Makarenko's pedagogical heritage creatively, but not explaining it, the author of the article encourages the use of some forms of work which are obviously out of place today.

For instance, the Ministry of Public Education has worked out and approved new programs for labor training of upper and lower grades in the children's homes. The program is based on the polytechnical principle. This stand, it seems to me, eliminates the need for recommending that children's homes establish "combined workshops open to all the children," such as Makarenko had. There are approved "Rules for Pupils," into which considerable educational thought has been put. Some of the points in the "Rules" should be used as slogans in character-forming work and there is no need to revive slogans employed in the past by Anton Semyonovich. If, for example, Makarenko's slogan "Don't whine!" were to appear today on the walls of a children's home it would cause natural puzzlement among the children.

The workers of the children's homes ask that the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences help them to learn how and what of Makarenko's pedagogical heritage can be put into practice in the children's homes in our day. - A. Romodanovskaya, Inspector of Children's Homes, Ivanovo Province Department of Public Education.

One Observation. - Every writer can make mistakes. But an author can often see his mistakes himself in the course of his work and, having seen them, correct them.....Makarenko did not include in his "Pedagogical Poem" and did not ever publish separately the text of the fragment "Evolution and Explosion."....It is quite understandable that Makarenko should have omitted this unfinished chapter from his book, because he had doubts about the truth and convincingness of the ideas it contained.... Why then, did the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences find it necessary to include precisely this fragment, which the author himself had repudiated, in the last volume of "Selected Pedagogical Works" of A. S. Makarenko (a supplement to the magazine Sovetskaya pedagogika)?..... There are some debatable points in Makarenko's works. The publication of his unfinished writings should be approached all the more carefully and critically, and each of them should be accompanied with corresponding commentary. - Maria Prilezhayeva.

Educating Through Traditions. - In his article Prof. Shimbirev first approved Makarenko's ideas and then with surprising ease dethroned and discounted them. Nobody has maintained or is maintaining that Makarenko "alone represents Soviet pedagogy." This idea was invented by the author of the article himself. We are concerned with the fact that the heritage of the great educator is not studied sufficiently and that the authors of education textbooks almost completely ignore this heritage. Up to now even the question of the philosophical and methodological basis of Makarenko's pedagogical ideas and system has not been studied deeply or explained.....

Makarenko raised the question of traditions of the school group. The schools of the entire country have praised and put into practice this simple and remarkable suggestion of this original educator. In our city there is a school called the Pushkin School. It bears the name of the great Russian poet proudly.

Every year it celebrates the anniversary of the poet - "the Pushkin days," the students call them. We also have a secondary school named for Shevchenko, which just as enthusiastically bases its school traditions on the life and work of the outstanding Ukrainian bard. New traditions supplant old ones, inculcate a communist attitude to work and to the heritage of the past, strengthen the group and instill Soviet patriotism. They must be cultivated and spread by all possible means. Makarenko, for instance, demanded that a habit of punctuality be established as a tradition.....

Prof. Shimbirev reproaches "zealous admirers of Makarenko" for striving to give wider application in the schools to the pedagogical heritage of the outstanding educator. He refers to Comrades Vigdorova, Pomerantseva and apparently a few other comrades who wrote in Literaturnaya gazeta as admirers of Makarenko. But how is it that a professor who speaks of his close ties with the schools has not noticed until now that hundreds of thousands of Soviet people are admirers of A. S. Makarenko?! - S. Salamatin, Deputy to the Mukachevo City Soviet, Transcarpathia Province and member of the Soviet's Standing Committee on Public Education.

We Must Study Makarenko, Kazan - An educator simply cannot work without assimilating the Makarenko heritage....How ignorant a biologist would seem who was not acquainted with the works of Michurin! Yet we still have many educators, including school principals, who have not studied Makarenko's basic works of theory. Moreover, there are schools that do not possess a single copy of the works of Makarenko. Even in the schools which have Makarenko's books there is often no organized study of his works....Not only an understanding of Makarenko but also practical application of his ideas is necessary....

Many questions raised by Makarenko are ignored by the theoreticians of education. The problems of the style of the group, collectivism, traditions - the most difficult pedagogical problems - are usually avoided. But they should and must be worked out on the basis of the experience of entire groups.... It is hard to find a realm or an individual problem in Soviet pedagogy which is not connected with the heritage of Makarenko. The creative assimilation of this heritage must play a great part. - Teacher E. Mingazov.

FOR 'EDUCATIONAL TECHNIQUES.' - Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (By Nik. Moshchansky, Literaturnaya gazeta, May 22, p.2. Condensed text:) Kalinin Province - Literaturnaya gazeta readers waited three months for prominent educators to take part in the discussion of A. S. Makarenko's heritage. Finally Prof. P. Shimbirev's article recently appeared in the press. The article was very interesting and especially so for teachers because it was the first time that a theoretician of education specified precisely what part of Makarenko's heritage he thinks cannot be employed in the Soviet schools because it is mistaken or obsolete.....

The Soviet teacher still does not have a scholarly work containing a comprehensive and thorough analysis of Makarenko's theory; and such a book is very much needed. Makarenko's experience stirs tremendous interest because it was successful and extremely effective. Thorough study of Makarenko is also needed because the prejudices against his theory, spread by some theoreticians of education, still survive. The teacher is told: "Makarenko did not work with 'normal' children. Makarenko did not work in a school. Makarenko wrote his works more than ten years ago."

Neither the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences nor the Russian Republic Ministry of Public Education has yet produced any guiding directive on how the educational system and experience of Makarenko should be applied in the schools. And

now some teachers and entire teachers' groups are beginning to study Makarenko's heritage on their own initiative and to apply it in their practical work. This is done without system, without guidance, sometimes indiscriminately, and in some cases may prove harmful..... The teacher is in urgent need of a good book on the methodology of communist education in which he could find a detailed analysis of Makarenko's principles and methods....In search of a work of this description, we recently turned to the education reference room of the Kalinin Pedagogical Institute. We were offered a thin notebook containing a haphazard bibliography of haphazard articles on ethics. And that was all!.....

We, the working teachers, are interested in Makarenko's experience and theory because they contain a great wealth of means and methods used by that outstanding Soviet educator. He rightly said that no talent can replace pedagogical skill and insisted on the necessity of teaching the teachers "pedagogical techniques," including even tone of voice, posture and ways of addressing pupils...

This aspect of his pedagogical heritage, like many other aspects, is of great practical value. Makarenko had many exact, well devised techniques. How does one prevent pupils from "ganging up?" How teach children to criticize one another? How conduct general meetings effectively and efficiently? (Let the reader remember the hourglass on the chairman's table at the Dzerzhinsky Commune.) How does one enforce cleanliness in the building? And even how train the children not to hold on to the bannisters? How make them lose the bad habit of spitting? All these and other similar questions were answered by Makarenko, who found the answers in experience and checked them repeatedly in practice....

How can one instill courage? Should one hold a discussion (on courage)? Should one read a story about a hero? ....Makarenko knew how to create situations, in which his pupils had to overcome fear by will power.

Yet here we have Professors Shimbirev and Ogorodnikov recommending in their textbook that "the child be kept in a room during the gradual transition from daylight to twilight and on to increasing darkness.....Because of the gradualness of the change, the child will show no fear and, as a result of this practice, he may become accustomed to darkness." "To instill courage," the same textbook recommends that the child be shown masks specially selected for this purpose - first attractive ones and later "terrifying" ones.

Instead of this ridiculous nonsense, Makarenko offers us a carefully constructed system of practical methods to instill not only courage but also discipline, honesty and love of work. He considered character education of great importance. Of course it is impossible to produce an exhaustive "technique" for all occasions in school life. Makarenko himself never pretended such a thing was possible and repeatedly emphasized that education is the most dialectical of sciences. But since surgery supplies the surgeon with precise instructions as to how to operate and what to do if certain complications arise; since the industrial technologist has at his disposal a thoroughly worked out description and methodology of the technological process, it is all the more vital that such important processes as those of the formation of the human personality should have their own technique....

For me, who has worked about 30 years in a school, and for many of my teacher colleagues, the works of Anton Semyonovich Makarenko have been a fortunate professional find and a great joy. Makarenko has remained our contemporary, not only as a writer but also as a gifted Soviet educator combining both theory and practice. The tremendous interest in his works on the part of the Soviet people, teachers, students and parents, is the best proof of the viability of many of his ideas.....

PRECIOUS HERITAGE - Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (Literaturnaya gazeta, June 26, p.2. Condensed text:)

Important Means of Education - Anton Semyonovich Makarenko declared there is nothing that united a group like traditions and that establishing and maintaining traditions is extremely important in education.... It is easy to find aspects of work and life in every school which can be made traditions....Every school can make good and useful traditions of the solemn ceremonies of the opening and closing days of the school year. The closing day requires a special ceremonial atmosphere in the school; parents and representatives of Soviet public life should be invited.... Makarenko considered it important from the educational viewpoint that a solemn ceremonial should be made of the important events in the life of the members of his colony and was very good at organizing such ceremonies simply and at the same time with educational effect. - N. Khilchenko, Teacher at the Altai Grain Elevator Technicum.

On Being Demanding of the Pupils. - In an overwhelming majority of cases, the struggle against breach of school discipline takes the form of moralizing and reasoning: "Remember that you are a Young Pioneer (or a Young Communist); aren't you ashamed of yourself?"

What is the weakness in this "method?" It is not demanding of the pupils nor does it show due respect for them, and, above all, the group of school children remains on the outside and sometimes silently sympathizes with the culprit. According to Makarenko, school children misbehave through lack of respect for the group; their conduct is dangerous because an individual opposes himself to the group and develops traits intolerable in our society.....

Makarenko raises the question of punishment in close connection with the questions of discipline and of being demanding of the pupils. He contends that punishment is not only a right, but in some instances also a duty. One should not exclaim with righteous indignation: "What, punishment in the Soviet school? But this is a return to the discipline of the cane!" Let us be logically consistent. The Soviet school must train the character. This is beyond doubt. But consistent and expedient punishment, with the interests of the group as its chief aim, is also an integral part in character training. The punishment must be just and must deter the culprit from repeating his misdemeanor.

Makarenko says punishment should not cause physical or moral suffering. We do not need to argue about corporal punishment. But as for moral suffering from punishment, something is wrong with Makarenko's theory: punishment which does not inflict moral suffering is a fiction. A pupil is at fault and he is barred, let us say, from carrying the troop banner. If he is proud of carrying the banner he would necessarily suffer. If he is indifferent to the punishment, the punishment is badly chosen. We contend that being demanding of the pupils and using punishment when needed go hand in hand, the one complementing the other. We agree with Makarenko that "punishment must have defined traditions and norms."

In the schools' "Rules for Pupils" much is said about how a student must behave and what he must not do. But they do not say what will be done to him if he fails to abide by these rules. The regulations mention punishment but in such a foggy way that one is left bewildered; those who violate discipline may be subjected to punishment "including expulsion from school." But what are the punishments up to and before this "including?"

Makarenko gives us the correct answer on how a student group should be

formed and shaped. He says that we must rely above all on the support of the Young Communist nucleus. The forms of Young Communist activity, the character training methods of the organization and the very manner of admission to the Y.C.L. - how imperfect, crude and soulless they are in many of our schools! Unfortunately, the education experts almost never help the schools in working out problems of Young Communist League activity. It seems to me that all this is due to the fact that while Makarenko came to write his books from living experience, some theoreticians of education are more concerned with dead systematization and abstract discourses. --A. Skorobogatov, Teacher at Vyazma Public School No. 20, Smolensk Province.

We Need Work Shops. - ...The question of polytechnical training and of children's socially useful work is not new.....V. I. Lenin paid special attention to the polytechnical training of youngsters. In working out the draft of the Party program he emphasized the necessity of socially useful shop work for children. Today, when tremendous construction, unprecedented in scope, is going on in our country, when Soviet technology is progressing with every passing hour, polytechnical training and teaching children socially useful work is of particular importance.

I believe that the schools must have their own work shops: wood-working shops, electro-mechanical shops and others. These shops must have a predetermined quota of output in order to make the children feel that they are useful to the school and to society. Through these shops the school graduates must acquire a general idea of technological processes and possibly even become specialized in some of them. Today, we have sufficient experience to organize children's productive work in a correct way, without interfering with their studies. That this can be done has been demonstrated by Makarenko's experience in the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune. This can be also seen from today's experience in our children's institutions and particularly from that of the labor reserves schools. -- V. Sheiko, Teacher of Russian Language and Literature, Alma-Ata.

Progress Is the Law - ...In my opinion F. Vigdorova is wrong in her interpretation of Makarenko's idea that the group must be preserved. Pointing out correctly that Makarenko insisted on the necessity of preserving the group, Comrade Vigdorova claims that Moscow School No. 201 is right not to merge the classes in extracurricular work. But Makarenko never claimed the smaller group to be absolutely inviolable. On the contrary, the small group (in this case the class) must not be left to withdraw into itself, for if it is, it can divorce itself from the student body of the school as a whole. Anton Semyonovich held that it is necessary to throw groups into more frequent contact and establish working cooperation among them.

A few words about play. Makarenko kept insisting that a children's organization must involve a lot of play because a child will work the way he plays. Makarenko repeatedly reproached the educators: "Why is it that as soon as it is a question of children everything becomes solemn and moralistic?" This is quite true. Young Pioneer troops often organize their activity on the pattern of adult organizations: there is little that is entertaining in it, little drama, not enough play -- prolonged active play in which obstacles must be overcome. Makarenko said that the chief trouble in many schools is a discrepancy between the lively, warm temperament of the 12 to 14 age group and the dullness of the children's group. -- P. Marofeyev, City of Molotov.

School and Parents. - Everybody is well aware that, together with the reasoning method which he considered the principal method in the educational system, Makarenko also accepted the method of compulsion and of developing in the youngster the sense of duty to obey the group and his seniors. It is often said that compulsion and obedience are inapplicable in our socialist educational system, that

they fetter initiative and thwart the child's development.

Life proves that this is wrong. A person in whom a sense of duty has been instilled from childhood - of duty to the group, to his comrades, to his seniors - a man who always regarded an assignment as a duty and always endeavored to carry it out is indisputably a person trained in necessary obedience. And, on the contrary, a man brought up under the wing of "kind nannies" who keep saying "he is still too little and cannot understand," who are not demanding of him, such a man enters life capricious, unstable, hypersensitive, with a dislike of work and an urge to dodge it. It would be absurd to give the principal place in the educational system to compulsion and to obedience based on it. But elementary order must be established here. In any case, compulsion and discipline inculcated in school must be fully supported by the parents at home. The collaboration between school and parents must be precise, complete and constant! It is the parents' sacred duty to support everything the school does, to support it every minute, every hour. They must be links in a single chain and the child must feel that a misdemeanor he commits at school will not be condoned at home and that papa and mama will not go to the school to complain of the teacher's severity (as sometimes happens!). A. Tsirkovsky, Moscow.

The Strength of the Group.- ....Once a few students of my class walked out during the physical culture lesson. The (physical culture) teacher asked the principal to call them in and give them a severe lecture. I could not agree to this. I remembered that Makarenko considered collective punishment harmful: boys who are united in their breach of discipline are further united by collective punishment and feel themselves more strongly apart from their organized comrades. In the second place, the larger and best part of the group remains aside from and passively observes the conflict. A talk with the principal would have created the illusion among the violators of discipline that they are responsible exclusively to him (and not to the group); that is why I asked the principal's permission to send him not the culprits, but the council of the (Young Pioneer) troop to apologize for what had happened and to pledge that there would be no further absenteeism in the class.

The principal agreed. At a general class meeting I began by voicing the demand of the physical culture teacher. Many children frowned in distaste. "Of course," I went on, "if you give me the word of your whole group that you will never again walk out during lessons, we could do something else." "We will keep our word! We won't walk out!" I was interrupted by a chorus of voices. "Then you may send the council of your troop to apologize for what has happened and to promise that this will never happen again in our class."

"Let the team leaders go to see the principal!" I was supported by voices which now sounded happy. But the team leaders were frowning now. One of them declared with bewilderment: "What goes on? Ivanov and Kashevarov walked out, but it is we who must make the apologies! I cannot pledge for them. Even if they promise, they will run away from the last class to see their pigeons. But I am willing to pledge myself for Tsyganov and Fyodorov." Here was a businesslike proposal. "Then let Ivanov and Kashevarov go to see the principal with the team leaders and do their own apologizing," some children suggested.

If he had to go to see the principal with all the culprits, Ivanov would not have minded being the first. But the group's lack of trust in him offended him: why did they think him worse than the others? He could keep his word, too. Only the day before he had been surrounded by false glory when he had sneaked out of the class, leading other boys along with him, and now he stood staring at his feet, pitiful and discredited. A discussion followed and it became obvious that

Ivanov was answerable, not only to the physical culture teacher, and the principal, but also to the entire class, that he owed an apology not only to the school administration, but also to his comrades. There is nothing with which to compare the strength of this collective influence. People may say that mine is a narrow, empirical approach to the problem. What connection has this incident with the high problems of education? I would say it has a direct connection! A pedagogical theory which is not floating in the clouds, which does not despise the teacher's everyday work, which helps him in it, constantly providing answers to what must be done and how one ought to react, is a true science of education! - V. Sinyayev, Teacher of Perovo Public School No. 5, Moscow Province.

IN STEP WITH THE LIFE OF THE COUNTRY - Published in discussion of the application of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage. (By N. Lukin, Principal of School No. 265, Moscow. Literaturnaya gazeta, Aug. 7, p.2. Condensed text:)

....I am not one of those teachers and school principals who set themselves the task of copying exactly all of A. S. Makarenko's methods. Such attempts usually fail. In education the mechanical application of specific forms of work without regard for the conditions or peculiarities of the times is doomed to failure..... The school which I run was established during the war years. The pupils and teachers came from many places. They had to put the school building in order, keep it clean, procure fuel and do the work in the shops themselves. The most important thing then was, of course, for the teachers to teach well and for the pupils to study well. Life forced us to search for methods with which a teacher could quickly and confidently rally the children into a solid group. And we must admit that the ideas and experience of A. S. Makarenko were of invaluable assistance to us in this search.

At first we directed the will and efforts of all the children in overcoming the difficulties the school experienced. Everyone from the youngest to the oldest worked hard. Each contributed a share of his work to the common cause. This laid the basis for the habits of social labor and behavior in the students and set the style of the school and its traditions....."If a group has no goal before it," said Makarenko, "then it is impossible to find a way of organizing the group. Each group needs a common, collective goal - not each class, but definitely each school." We did not have to invent this goal: life presented it to us. This goal was expressed briefly and clearly: "Everything for the front, everything for victory."

Once a representative of an army mail sorting center came to the school and requested help in sorting letters. The Young Pioneers and Young Communists responded joyfully. They decided to send 30 to 40 of the best pupils to the mail sorting center every day. In four months the children sorted about 500,000 letters. This work evidently was what prompted the children to start writing letters to the soldiers at the front and in hospitals. The children wrote about how they were helping the children's homes where soldiers' orphans lived, about the Timur movement (a wartime movement among Soviet children, from the name of the hero of a children's book whose group did patriotic good deeds) and about their other activities. Soon we were receiving a great deal of mail in reply.....

In one month alone we received 200 such letters. The children felt that not only the teachers, but all the people demanded good studies and firm discipline from them and the educational effect of such letters on lazy children was much stronger than our reprimands and admonitions.

At one Young Communist League meeting the children declared they wanted to make a contribution to the equipment of the army. The secretary of the Young Communist League committee made this proposal: "We cannot collect enough money to

buy a tank or an airplane, but we can surely buy a machine gun. Let us ask Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin to have a machine gun made in the name of School No. 265 and to give it to the best Young Communist machine gunner." The proposal was adopted eagerly and three days later the money was collected and deposited in the bank. With great excitement and love the children spent a long time composing a letter to Comrade Stalin....

I went out onto the school porch. A car stood at the entrance. An army courier took a package from his pouch. "A letter for you from Comrade Stalin," he said. The news of the letter spread among the children in an instant. The school buzzed. All the pupils gathered. As soon as I entered the room there was silence. I opened the envelope and read aloud:

"To Comrade Lukin, Principal, School No. 265, Moscow: Convey my most cordial greetings and the thanks of the Red Army to the Young Pioneers and school children of Moscow School No. 265 and to the pupils of the vocational training shops, who collected 10,000 rubles to manufacture a machine gun in the name of Moscow School No. 265 and the vocational training shops. The wish of the pupils will be fulfilled. J. Stalin."

The burst of joy I felt that day is hard to convey in words. The children promised the leader to study hard and persistently. Years have passed. The pupils who promised Comrade Stalin to hold high the banner of the school are no longer in the school. But the precious letter hangs in the same place of honor in the teachers' room and each year on Sept. 1, when the principal and the teachers greet the children at the beginning of the school year, the promise which our Young Pioneers and Young Communists made to the leader eight years ago is recalled. On that day we try to explain to the children that their predecessors made that promise not only for themselves but for the whole school, for all the children who would study in that school for ten or 20 years to come and for those who are crossing its threshold for the first time now....

Occasionally former pupils come back to the school. Meeting with the pupils, they tell them how the school lived and worked during the war years, how a comradely, united body of pupils and teachers was formed in struggle and in labor. Such talks have an immense educational value. It becomes clear to the new pupils how and by whom the order in the school, the style of the school and its traditions were established. Once a colonel, a former pupil, came to see us. I took him into one of the most unruly classes - the sixth grade. He told the children about himself and his comrades and finished his talk by saying that in the heat of war he had not forgotten his school and he was proud of it. After this talk, the children of the sixth grade promised to be good.

A week went by. I was sitting in the teachers' room. There was a knock on the door. A boy from the sixth grade came in and, rather embarrassed, said: "The class teacher wants you to come to our room." "They've been up to something again," I thought with annoyance. "Only a week has passed and the pledge is broken. There you have your education and your psychology and all that, multiplied by practical experience!" Silence reigned in the classroom. The teacher said that she had called me at the request of the children. They had a problem they could not settle. "Well, who will tell me your troublesome problem?" I asked. There was a rustle. All eyes turned to the chairman of the Young Pioneer troop council.

It turned out that one of the school children had not studied his lessons and had been rude to the teacher and to his comrades. "He is disgracing us and shaming our school," said the children. "The class asks you to expel him from school." I realized I was seeing in action a method approved by Makarenko, that I was seeing a healthy group that had decided to punish a negligent comrade. But the

children's anger was hasty. Putting it off to a later time, I suggested they think it over once more and that the next day before class they should give me their final opinion. Next day, after a stormy meeting, the children decided that the offender should remain and that all the class should help him.....

The years of peaceful, constructive labor began, the years of the great construction projects, of the great Stalin plan of transforming nature...This spring I saw a group of children. For several days they had been gathering at the same places and were engaged in something with animation. I went up to them and asked: "What are you doing here?" "We're playing. Why can't we play here? If we can't, we'll go away." "No, no, go ahead and play." "Can we play?" said a boy. "We've been chased away everywhere." It was obvious that this friendly group had suffered many "unpleasantnesses" before they had found a place to play. I asked them what they were playing. "Do you see this big stream here? That's the Volga and this is the Don and this the Volga-Don Canal and this is the Tsimlyanskaya Reservoir and Hydroelectric Station and this is the Kuibyshev one."....

"I'm going to build subways. When they finish in Moscow they'll build them in other cities," said one child. "I'm going to construct high buildings and then the Palace of the Soviets," interrupted another. Thus the dreams of our children are woven around actuality, for these dreams are not empty ones, but genuine ones that can be realized. We cultivate these dreams and strivings in our pupils by all our educational and character-forming work.....

The correctness of an idea is tested by practice. Life itself, the educational problems and tasks to which reality gives rise every day, forces us to give attentive study and application to Makarenko's ideas. On the basis of our experience, I can say with certainty that the principles of his educational ideas are correct and useful....

- -

With this article the editors conclude the discussion of the problems of applying A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage:

CONCERNING A. S. MAKARENKO'S PEDAGOGICAL HERITAGE. (Literaturnaya gazeta, August 11, p.2. Complete text:)

It is no accident that the problem of A. S. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage, raised in the pages of Literaturnaya gazeta, has attracted wide attention from readers and has stimulated many lively statements of view. A. S. Makarenko was "an engineer of the human soul" not only as an author but also as an outstanding Soviet innovator in education. He was not only a theoretician advancing new methods of Soviet pedagogy, but also a practicing educator whose experience, according to A. M. Gorky's testimony, "has world significance." He was an artist of education, a man of lofty ideas, daring, forceful, ardent and honest; even today, after the passage of many years, his educational ideas stimulate the minds and animate the feelings of Soviet men.

To Makarenko A. M. Gorky wrote: "You are an astonishing individual and just the kind Russia needs." Both in his practical activity and in his writings Makarenko stands before us as an exponent of the active spirit of Bolshevist education.

I. School and Socialist Society. - Soviet education is based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and on the government's and the Party's practical directives on questions of public education. The Party teaches that not only the school but also all our Soviet life, all our new socialist relationships,

are mighty educational factors. Lenin emphasized: "We would have no faith in teaching, education and instruction if they were limited only to school and dis-associated from the pulse of life." The Leninist principle of the Soviet school's link with life attained its concrete expression in the Party and government resolutions on the schools. These point out that the schools must give pupils a deep and solid knowledge of scientific principles and provide a communist education of the rising generation. The Party resolutions on the schools particularly emphasize that the fundamental form of school instruction is the teacher's classroom lesson.

The great role of the lesson as the fundamental form of instruction, however, certainly does not mean that instruction exhausts the problem of education. The Party Central Committee's Sept. 5, 1931, decree on the schools emphasized that "of exceptional importance is reliable communist character training in the Soviet school and an intensified struggle against any attempts to implant elements of anti-proletarian ideology in Soviet school children." In the past 20 years Party resolutions on ideological questions and statements by leading Party officials have frequently made mention of what our education must make of our rising generation and how this education should be effected. M. I. Kalinin said: "If I were asked what is the most important thing demanded of a teacher today, I would say - to produce a new man.....The new man of socialist society is being created among us. This new man must be imbued with the best human qualities."

Guided by the Party Central Committee decrees on the schools, Soviet teachers have made great progress in improving instruction. It must be said, however, that while successfully solving general educational problems, many of our schools have not yet attained a high level of character-training work, particularly in ethical training. This is in large measure the fault of the theoreticians of education. They do not give proper study or scientific generalization to the experience of outstanding teachers in the field of ethical training. This passive attitude on the part of educational theoreticians toward constructive elaboration of the best teaching experience is reflected in the indifference which they manifest to the heritage of A. S. Makarenko.

II. Education in the Collectivist Spirit. - The heritage of writings and theory left by A. S. Makarenko is very diversified. It includes novels, tales, short stories, plays, scenarios and newspaper articles. Makarenko was a militant innovator, fighting everything that impeded the development of Soviet education. At a time when many educational theorists continued to bow slavishly before foreign authorities, Makarenko rejected hardened canons and advanced courageously along the path of developing a Marxist-Leninist science of education. It is no accident that pedants and traditionalists of every stripe, who at that time were very active in education, greeted his works with derision.

"A Pedagogical Poem," for example, was described as "a literary manifesto against pedagogy." As for "A Book For Parents," it was said to be "an effort to impugn the authority of the educator in family upbringing and to calumniate the teacher and the Soviet school - an attempt injurious to the whole field of education." The apponents of an authentically Bolshevist creative spirit in education lashed out against Makarenko's innovations and writings and, in an effort to put his ideas in opposition to Soviet education, posed as defending that education from him.

Let us recall the state of the science of education in our country during the years when Makarenko worked in the children's colonies. This was the time when the Soviet school was being set up and pedagogy was not yet restored to its rights. "Leftists" who advocated the anti-Leninist "theory" of the withering away of the

school were active on the educational front. Makarenko thus stated his attitude to this type of "theoretician:" "Especially do I esteem educational theory. It is educational theory that I love, not educational nonsense, and sometimes all kinds of nonsense is called educational theory. I want educational theory to be real."

Fifteen years ago, on July 4, 1936, the Party Central Committee adopted a decree "On Educational Distortions in the System of the People's Commissariats of Education." This decree fully restored education, as a science, in its rights. Since that time much has been done to make pedagogical theory "real." Even today, however, a tendency has been noticed on the part of those holding to pedantic views and therefore indifferent to Makarenko's pedagogical heritage, as well as on the part of several of his supporters, to oppose Makarenko and Soviet education to one another. Some maintain that Makarenko deviates greatly from the principles of Soviet education and consequently is not for us; others are inclined to maintain that Makarenko has his own special "pedagogical system" and that it is "a panacea for all ills."

Makarenko's pedagogical heritage comprises not only his lectures on education, his newspaper articles on the theory of problems of education, but, first and foremost, his "Pedagogical Poem," "one of the most significant and inspiring literary landmarks of our time," and his other creative writing. "A Pedagogical Poem," "Flags on the Towers" and "A Book for Parents" have played, are playing and will continue to play a large role in the education of Soviet youth, in propagating advanced ideas of communist education. It should constantly be remembered that these are not scientific treatises, but works of art. It must be remembered that many educational methods described by Makarenko in his creative writings cannot now be introduced into the Soviet educational system in their old form, just as the children and youngsters being reared in the schools and the children's homes are not at all the same of those brought up by Makarenko. They require a different approach, different "pedagogical tactics."

For correct and creative utilization of Makarenko's pedagogical heritage it is important that we do not blindly copy his educational methods, but above all determine the principles upon which these methods rest. What is the theoretic basis of Makarenko's views? A careful examination of Makarenko's works permits us to draw, first, the conclusion that this basis has its origin in the Marxist, Soviet conception of the role of the individual and the group.

The socialist principle of character training of the individual in the group, through the group and for the group is the keystone of Makarenko's educational work. "The product of our education, whoever he may be," wrote Makarenko, "can never become the bearer of a personal perfection, only a good or honest man. He must first of all always be a member of his group, a member of society responsible not only for his own acts, but also for those of his comrades."

N. Lukin's article "In Step With the Life of the Country" convincingly shows how a school collective, during and since the war, has sensitively responded to events experienced by the country, how this tie between school and life helps to solve complex problems of education. Makarenko elaborated a number of fundamental principles concerning the group and the ways and means of bringing up a man to live by all the interest of Soviet society. "Proper Soviet education," he emphasized, "must be organized by creating unified, strong and influential collectives. The school must be a united group in which all the character-forming processes are organized and the individual member of this group must realize his dependence on it, the group; he must be devoted to the interests of the group, defend these interests and cherish these interests above all else."

Makarenko differentiated between the smaller group (the class) and the entire school group. He felt that "children in school must of course be organized according to grades," that it is impossible to disregard age differences in organizing the smaller groups. At the same time, he felt that organizing the children's group solely on the basis of educational level (grade) narrows and impoverishes the group's activity. The long experience of our schools confirms the error of confining the group within the framework of grade, by purely educational and age levels. Unification and cooperation among pupils of various age levels can be facilitated by the Young Communist League and Young Pioneer organizations, by work projects, sports circles and clubs, and general school assemblies and holiday celebrations.

Properly realizing that the group's interests are the cornerstone of our social relationships, Makarenko placed inculcation of the collectivist outlook, the collectivist spirit, first among the educational tasks accomplished via the group. "The deepest purport of character training," he wrote, "....lies in the selection and training of man's urges, leading them to that ethical level possible only in a classless society and which alone can spur man to fight for greater perfection. The morally justified urge is the urge of the collectivist, that is, of a man bound to his group by the single purpose of progress, by unity of effort, by the vital and certain sense of his duty to society."

III. A. S. Makarenko's Educational Methods. - The numerous responses from teachers received by the editors from Kaliningrad, Sakhalin, Baku, Naryan-Mar, Tambov, Krasnodar, Irkutsk, Kiev - from all over our country - testify to the vitality of the principle, formulated by Makarenko and confirmed by his brilliant experience, that character training should be conducted in the group, through the group and for the group. Basing themselves on this guiding educational principle, relying on their personal experience and on Makarenko's experience and conclusions, outstanding Soviet teachers make mention of several methods of character training that Makarenko formulated and that they are successfully applying today in our schools.

The most essential of these methods are the following: An important conclusion that Makarenko drew from his 16 years of pedagogical experience is that it is impossible to train the children's group properly without the existence of a real, unified teachers' group. "Beyond a shadow of a doubt," he said, "the children's group cannot be trained if each of 15 teachers conducts the training in his own manner and as he wishes."

Makarenko made it clear that creating this unified body of teachers is a difficult task. It demands of each teacher great discipline, the ability to subordinate vain ambition to the interests and accomplishments of the group. The difficult task (of establishing the group) demands much work from the group's leader and from each of its members, but it brings a wonderful result - a firmly knit teachers' group with good Soviet style of work. More than once Makarenko expressed regret that "teachers have not yet been helped to understand that normal work by the schools is unthinkable in the absence of a firmly knit teachers' group, bolstered by a common methodology and collectively responsible not only for 'their' classes but also for the entire school as a whole." Unfortunately, even today, as teachers' letters indicate, the importance of a unified teachers' group is often underestimated, a genuine teachers' group does not exist in many schools, unified educational standards are lacking, the teachers' council does not function creatively and there is no genuine criticism and self-criticism.

Makarenko's second conclusion lies in placing before the student body a big goal, a clear, optimistic, healthy perspective - what this original educator called "the future joy." "....All our Party's life, all the life of the working class and

its struggle," A. A. Zhdanov said at the first All-Soviet Congress of Soviet Writers, "consist in the combination of the hardest, most sober practical work with the greatest heroics and grandiose perspectives." Makarenko has in mind perspectives of social and individual significance. Starting from the lofty ethical standards that define Soviet man, he draws the valid conclusion: the loftier and more socially significant the goals and purposes determining the activity of a given man, the higher his moral level. Makarenko insisted that personal happiness must not be "shameful" happiness, must not spring from the soil of individualism, at another's expense; great and genuine happiness appears when man's individual activity harmonizes with the common movement toward a lofty goal, when individual achievements originate on the basis of serving a social purpose.

In the works of Makarenko himself we find splendid examples of guiding the group, training it, with the help of perspectives. A brilliant example of this kind is the transfer of the colony to Kuryazh and the preparation for this transfer described in "A Pedagogical Poem." Literaturnaya gazeta's readers feel that in school healthy perspectives must be set both in studies and in character training. The children must understand the great goals by which our entire nation and our whole Soviet country live. With these social tasks they must link their private affairs.

Makarenko's third conclusion is the salutary role of traditions in forming the character of youth. The group does not forget the ground it has traversed; and the best in its experience it zealously conserves and accumulates as traditions of communist behavior. "Nothing consolidates the group so much as traditions," Makarenko said. "A particularly important aspect of educational work is to nurture traditions and to maintain them. A school that lacks traditions naturally cannot be a good school, and the best schools I have seen..... are schools that have accumulated traditions." In Makarenko's works we find innumerable instances of skillful employment of traditions, large and small. Our readers write of this, too. N. Khilchenko, teacher in the Altai Grain Elevator Technicum; S. Salamatin, Mukachevo City Soviet Deputy and others, have presented convincing examples of the salutary role of communist traditions in character formation in school groups.

Many of Makarenko's views on questions of the group's influence on the individual, on discipline, have immense practical and theoretical value. Lenin teaches that every new social order creates its form of social contact of people and its own type of work discipline. Heeding this injunction of Lenin's, Makarenko draws the conclusion that the old, prerevolutionary discipline - a discipline compelling workers to blind obedience - could not contribute to the development of high moral human qualities. Soviet discipline is the conscious discipline of accomplishment, the discipline of struggle and progress. In Makarenko's interpretation, socialist, Soviet discipline is reflected in the choice of conduct must useful to Soviet society. Naturally, violations of discipline in this, its new meaning, are acts that are sometimes illegal and always antimoral. The question of punishment as a necessary measure of communist character training here acquires special importance. During his lifetime Makarenko was compelled to wage a serious struggle on this point against the advocates of so-called "soft-spoken education." Although subsequently Makarenko's deliberations on punishment, weighed and elaborated with his customary sensitive pedagogical understanding, did not meet open opposition from education theoreticians, they were often ignored or were emasculated by numerous reservations.

Makarenko maintains that punishment must be supported by the authority of the student group. At the same time he feels that punishment cannot "be made

an everyday occurence in the group - punishment must be so rare as to focus the entire group's attention upon the punishment that is inflicted."

Intimately associated with Makarenko's teaching on the group as the object and means of character training are his views on the child's family upbringing. Socialist society creates the basis for genuine family happiness, insured by harmony between individual and social life. Nevertheless, wrote Makarenko, "socialist traditions and traditions of communist comportment in the family sphere have not yet become widespread among us nor have we accumulated tried traditions in this sphere." Makarenko, incidentally, expressed the following idea: "....Of prime necessity is the proper and purposeful organization of influences on the child, directed by great pedagogical knowledge. The organization of influences on the child within the family must come through broad pedagogical propaganda, through the example of the good family, through increasing the demands upon the family." One such method of governmental pedagogical influence on the family was, for Makarenko, contact between the students' group and the family, a contact which he persistently developed.

Makarenko holds that the Soviet family, by its very nature, must be a collective. "By losing the aspects of a collective, the family loses a large part of its significance as an organizer of character training and happiness," he wrote. Such, briefly, are Makarenko's fundamental views on questions of communist upbringing. They can and must be applied in our family and school life. It is not difficult to see that Makarenko's pedagogical views rest upon the Marxist-Leninist teaching. Nor is it difficult to see the influence of the educational ideas of our great revolutionaries and democrats upon Makarenko's pedagogy, this exacting and courageous pedagogy, pedagogy of "will and struggle." All Makarenko's pedagogy is infused with Gorky's optimistic faith in man, faith combined with high demands. "Make the highest demands upon man, but at the same time give him the highest respect" - this is the motto, the thread running through all Makarenko's educational work. "Our entire system of education," Makarenko wrote, "is the realization of Stalin's slogan of attentiveness to the human being."

IV. Some Critical Observations. - However, there are individual postulates of Makarenko's pedagogical heritage and substantial gaps in his so-called "pedagogical system" which merit the critical observations by educational theoreticians and teachers. Let us dwell on the more serious of these observations. Makarenko does not offer an explicitly stated, integrated system of pedagogical views. Makarenko's pedagogical heritage does not contain one work which represents an integrated exposition of the entire gamut of educational problems. Moreover, such an exhaustive "pedagogical course" cannot be had by compiling in one book selected works by Makarenko. At best such a method would make possible the constitution of part of a course of pedagogy which treats some of the laws of character training of the rising Soviet generation, excepting questions of education and instruction. It will contain neither researches on intellectual education nor an examination of principles and problems of instruction, of programs and methods of teaching or systems and forms of classroom lessons. Makarenko's pedagogical works touch most sparingly on questions of physical education and almost leave in the dark questions of the work of the Young Communists and Young Pioneer organizations in schools.

Makarenko does not elaborate questions of character training in the process of instruction, in the course of lessons. Being a commune director, Makarenko, of course, concerned himself with the organization of the teaching process in its organic unity with the tasks of character training. But in his works, literary and pedagogical, this has not received the expression it merits, and consequently we can cull very little from Makarenko's works regarding character training in the process of instruction. Moreover, while Makarenko was a talented master

of character training, he underestimated its great significance in the instructional process and permitted himself to treat this question erroneously by separating character training from teaching and instruction. "I have a propensity to divorce the process of upbringing from the process of instruction," he said. "I know that every pedagogical specialist objects to this. But I maintain that the character training process and skill can be logically isolated." With this very hazy formulation, Makarenko, as it were, recognizes a division of educators into two categories: educators, strictly speaking, engaged in character training and upbringing, and teachers, excluded from this process. It is not accidental that, in describing the Dzerzhinsky Commune in "A Pedagogical Poem," Makarenko did not feel constrained to show the everyday studies of the secondary school and workers' college.

The "explosion method" described by Makarenko is debatable. The unsuccessful and inexact formulations which Makarenko used in defining his method of "a steady stream of demands" by the group upon one of its members to achieve a change in his conduct are capable of being misconstrued. But Makarenko did not oppose the "explosion" to constant, persistent character training; on the contrary, he essentially regarded the so-called "explosion" as a component part of this work. Regarding the term "explosion," Makarenko himself said: "Perhaps a more successful pedagogical word will be found." Prof. P. Shimbirev termed "the explosion method" antipedagogical, improperly attributing to a particular method the significance of a universal principle that Makarenko himself did not attribute to it.

A. Skorobogatov, a teacher, criticized Makarenko's opinion that punishment ought not to occasion moral suffering. Comrade Skorobogatov writes: "Punishment which does not inflict moral suffering is a fiction. A pupil is at fault and he is barred, let us say, from carrying the troop banner. If he is proud of carrying the banner, he would necessarily suffer. If he is indifferent to the punishment, the punishment is badly chosen."

Letters to the editor contain a number of valid readers' observations relative to individual inaccurate and faulty formulations and postulates in Makarenko's works. Let us cite one example. In one of his lectures, Makarenko said: "Character training is largely effected before the age of five years and what you have accomplished up to the age of five is 90% of the entire character training process." This hyperbolic assertion of Makarenko is refuted by all our practical work, by all the rich and talented experience of Makarenko himself; evidently he made the assertion to emphasize the special importance of early childhood upbringing. Makarenko likewise permitted himself many inaccuracies and contradictions in his various utterances on the essence of discipline and daily regimen. But these isolated erroneous or faulty formulations and the existence of "blank spots" in Makarenko's system of pedagogical views cannot obscure from us the valuable contributions he boldly introduced into Soviet education. It merely convinces us once more of the necessity to proceed, finally, to a careful analysis of Makarenko's pedagogical heritage and to its constructive elaboration. In addition, it is necessary to warn against an unreserved and uncritical attitude to this heritage, against the attempts of a few intemperate disciples of Makarenko to transform him into almost the sole, singlehanded founder of Soviet education.

V. Urgent Tasks of Education - The numerous letters of Soviet teachers, published and unpublished, to the editors; educators' conferences on the application of the Makarenko heritage (for example, the one in Sverdlovsk); teachers' statements in Uchitelskaya gazeta, in the province and republic press; many valuable works in the latest "Pedagogical Readings" (reports and discussions at periodic teachers' conferences) - all these bear witness to the huge interest in Makarenko's works. But if we carefully consider the process of mastering Makarenko's heritage, we see, side by side with the good, vital and useful elements for schools

something that is certainly cause for alarm. There are some instances of unhistorical, mechanical utilization of Makarenko's theories and practices; instances of vulgarized application of mere isolated, external aspects of Makarenko's work (frequently hardly suitable to our times) while ignoring his basic educational principles. Fundamental and secondary principles and methods, the vital and the obsolete in Makarenko's heritage are, at times, lumped together.

From Makarenko himself must be learned a critical attitude toward his experience and toward his postulates, formulated in the past; the ability to discard what is narrow, one-sided and obsolete. Makarenko said: "What was done during my lifetime and that of my colleagues and the commune members was still only experimental. Obviously, to reach well defined conclusions from this experience it is necessary not merely to check but to double-check." From this it is apparent that while rigidly verifying his experience, Makarenko was man enough to repudiate initial conclusions and deductions. Thus he underwent a significant evolution of views on work as an educational method, repudiating the original enthusiasm for "linking" the child's work processes with his general education. He later repudiated his erroneous thesis of dissociating character training from instruction and reached the valid conclusion that "problems and methods of character training cannot be restricted by questions of teaching." He was very self-critical of the so-called "explosion method," as we have seen.

In education there cannot be lifeless and inert standards. "I am personally convinced of the following," Makarenko said in one of his lectures; "If we take the typical Soviet school, if we provide it with good teachers and organizers and if this school endures 20 years, in the course of these 20 years it will traverse such a great path that the educational system at the beginning and at the end will differ vastly." Seizing upon individual educational methods or the body of methods that Makarenko successfully applied under specific conditions 20 years ago and mechanically applying these methods today in our schools certainly is not proper utilization of his pedagogical heritage. What is needed is constructive and critical application in the schools' practical work of the theoretical foundation and fundamental methods that reflect Makarenko's pedagogical views, at the same time discarding all that is obsolete and inapplicable under conditions of modern public education.

In their letters to the editor teachers and parents correctly point out that the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and departments of education in the universities should give greater, on-the-spot assistance to Soviet teachers and to parents' groups so that they may correctly interpret the Makarenko heritage. Unfortunately, except for reportorial and superficial articles about Makarenko, the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences has done nothing in this respect. The magazine Sovetskaya pedagogika confines itself to anniversary plaudits to Makarenko and does not concern itself with propagating Makarenko's valuable methods and with establishing them firmly in school practice.

The Party Central Committee decree "On Educational Distortions in the System of the People's Commissariats of Education" pointed out that "the broad, versatile experience of the vast army of school workers has not been elaborated or generalized..." It must be said that our science of education has not yet drawn all the necessary conclusions from this directive. Yet it is precisely the direct study of the very rich collective experience of teachers and constructive generalization of this experience - a careful and critical examination of Makarenko's pedagogical views on the plane of their application in the practice of schools today - that would contribute to overcoming the fundamental and most blatant vice of this science: the lag of theory behind the practical work of Soviet schools, behind life and the demands of the modern age.

The Ministries of Public Education and the Russian Republic Academy of Pedagogical Sciences must take a clear and explicit stand on questions of the utilization of Makarenko's pedagogical heritage, breaking the resistance of conservatives who are attempting to change such a constructive, dialectical science as education into stagnant and rigid dogma. It is incumbent upon educators to encourage everything new and progressive that is being conceived in their midst and to apply such new elements. It is patent that to realize such a creative mission educators must effectuate vital contact between theory and practice, and genuine, not formal, criticism and self-criticism. The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences is still badly, very badly, carrying out even its own resolutions. More than a year ago Literaturnaya gazeta published an editorial entitled "The Science of Education Does Not Allow Stagnation." This article made particular mention of the fact that the Academy's elaboration of questions of instruction does not utilize Pavlov's teachings; that the Academy's research activity does not give due treatment to problems of preparing pupils for life and for work; that the rural school is not esteemed by the Academy; that the best contributions of teachers to the "Pedagogical Readings" are not duly generalized and propagated; that many works published by the Academy are on a low scientific and theoretic level.

The Academy Presidium, in an extensive decree regarding the aforementioned article, recognized the validity of the criticism and outlined a comprehensive list of "measures" to be taken. But a year has passed and the Academy has not overcome the shortcomings.

In a speech a few months before his death, Anton Semyonovich Makarenko told Leningrad teachers that he wanted "to undertake a great task:" "For three years I have been thinking of writing an important book on communist education, not a popular book but a real academic one." The task of educational theoreticians is to generalize the foremost experience of Soviet teachers and, relying upon this experience, ultimately to fashion a method of communist education, to write that "real academic book" for which Anton Semyonovich Makarenko laid the talented foundation.

The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences must proffer assistance to Soviet teachers and set forth an integrated, critical generalization and analysis of Makarenko's pedagogical views. It seems to us that what is first needed is a work which would facilitate application to the practical work of instruction of the basic principles and educational methods suggested by Makarenko.

Makarenko was a model of the propagandist of Marixt-Leninist educational ideas, the bearer of these ideas to the broad masses. Makarenko ardently loved children, he loved and esteemed the beauty of new Soviet man. Replying to a remark by the antipatriotic critic F. Levin that the book "Flags on the Towers" has many handsome characters, Makarenko said: "Why don't you reproach Leo Tolstoi because 'War and Peace' contains so many handsome and beautiful characters? He loved his class. I love my society. Many people are beautiful to me."

The advanced, progressive aspect of Makarenko's pedagogical views resides above all in the fact that in the final analysis they serve the great reformative ends of the Bolshevist party and the Soviet government.

The object of Makarenko's pedagogical heritage must not and cannot be its preservation in historical archives, material for uninspired pedantic writings. Makarenko's legacy, cleansed of its individual erroneous and obsolete concepts, is an effective and militant arm in the arsenal of communist education, and must be treated precisely as such an arm.

# # # #